DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 343 HE 025 239

AUTHOR Low, Jane M.
TITLE The Davis Social Environment-1990: A Report of Student Opinions.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Davis. Office of Student Affairs Research and Information.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 39p.; For related documents, see HE 025 240-246.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alcohol Abuse; Blacks; College Housing; *College Students; Ethnic Groups; Higher Education; Parking Facilities; Racial Bias; Racial Relations; School Security; *Social Environment; State Universities; *Student Attitudes; Student Characteristics; Student Transportation
IDENTIFIERS Student Opinion Survey; *University of California Davis

ABSTRACT

A study was done to examine student opinion of the social environment on the University of California Davis campus in Spring 1990 as a follow up to a similar study conducted in 1987. The study used the Student Opinion Survey and mailed it to a stratified random sample of 1,649 students. Of the surveys sent, 57.7 percent were returned. The following findings are reported: (1) students are, for the most part, satisfied with the campus' social environment; (2) they are more satisfied than their national peers; (3) satisfaction declined between 1987 and 1990; (4) as in the 1987 survey, satisfaction levels among ethnic groups varied considerably with Black students substantially less satisfied that undergraduates overall; (5) students were well satisfied with food, housing and campus-sponsored mass transit services, but dissatisfied with parking facilities and services; (6) students expressed mixed levels of satisfaction with social interactions on campus with concern about racial harmony; (7) undergraduates considered racial intolerance the most serious problem among the intolerance issues including in the survey; (8) students saw alcohol abuse as the most serious of the health issues; and (9) students were more concerned with personal security and safety issues on campus than in 1987. Included are 14 tables and an appendix detailing student responses. (Author/JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341343

THE DAVIS SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT—1990

A Report of Student Opinions

Jane M. Low

Student Affairs Research and Information

University of California, Davis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

April 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

UC Davis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 025 239

THE DAVIS SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT—1990
A REPORT OF STUDENT OPINIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study, based on the ACT Student Opinion Survey conducted in Spring 1990, examines the perceptions of undergraduates enrolled at UC Davis. It follows up a similar study of the social environment of the campus conducted in 1987. Data were collected with a survey mailed to a stratified random sample of 1,649 students; of the surveys sent, 57.7% were returned.

The report identifies the following major findings:

- Davis undergraduates are, for the most part, satisfied with the campus' social environment.
- They are more satisfied than their national peers with a majority of the items used to assess the social environment.
- Satisfaction with most aspects of the social environment declined between 1987 and 1990.
- As was the case in 1987, satisfaction levels among ethnic groups vary considerably. Black students are substantially less satisfied than undergraduates overall with nearly all aspects of the social environment, Whites and Asians are generally the most satisfied, while Chicanos fall between these extremes.
- Davis undergraduates are fairly satisfied with most campus extracurricular programs and services, especially recreational and intramural programs. Since 1987, satisfaction declined for three extracurricular activities, rose for cultural programs, and remained unchanged for religious programs. Despite active participation, Black students are least satisfied, especially with cultural programs.
- Students are well satisfied with food, housing and campus-sponsored mass transit services, but quite dissatisfied with parking facilities and services. Satisfaction ratings declined for all services in this category except availability of student housing. Black students express the lowest levels of satisfaction with these services, while Asians and Whites report the highest.
- Students overall express mixed levels of satisfaction with social interactions on the campus. Although well satisfied with the attitude of faculty toward students, they are very dissatisfied with racial harmony and with the degree to which students are treated as individuals. Satisfaction with racial harmony dropped substantially, as did concern for the student as an individual, but to a lesser degree. Black students are much less satisfied than other students, most notably with racial harmony.
- Undergraduates consider racial intolerance the most serious problem among the intolerance issues included in the survey: race, homosexuality, foreign origin and disability. Students report higher levels of concern than those in 1987 with all four areas, particularly race. Black students, and Chicanos to a lesser extent, perceive each area of intolerance as more of a problem than other students.
- Davis students single out alcohol abuse as the most serious of the health issues included in this study. Their level of concern with alcohol and drug abuse on campus dropped slightly, but sexually transmitted diseases was perceived as somewhat more of a problem. Among racial/ethnic groups, Black students express the highest levels of concern for all of these health problems.
- Students are substantially more concerned about personal security and safety issues on campus than in 1987. Despite this change, they are still moderately satisfied with personal security/safety, while neither sexual harassment nor assaults on students are perceived as serious problems. Black students are most concerned about campus safety; Chicano, Asian and White students express lower but similar levels of concern.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY 2

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES 3

FOOD, HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION 6

SOCIAL INTERACTIONS ON CAMPUS 10

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: INTOLERANCE 16

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: HEALTH ISSUES 20

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: PERSONAL SECURITY & SAFETY 23

SUMMARY 27

APPENDIX

Table A-1 Food Services
Table A-2 Availability of Student Housing
Table A-3 Racial Harmony at UC Davis
Table A-4 Concern for Student as an Individual
Table A-5 How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Racial Intolerance?
Table A-6 How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance of Homosexuality?
Table A-7 How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Intolerance of Foreign Origin?
Table A-8 How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is Alcohol Abuse?

INTRODUCTION

The University of California, Davis has long enjoyed a reputation as a student-centered institution dedicated to providing a stimulating, safe and caring environment. But as early as 1987, there were signs of serious erosion within this positive environment. Undergraduate enrollment had begun to grow rapidly, often in unpredictable or unanticipated spurts. The number of students increased faster than the courses needed or services demanded; lines formed where none had been before; and students found themselves competing for attention from faculty and staff.

At the same time, the composition of the student body was changing. No longer a predominately White, upper-middle-class institution, UC Davis was becoming increasingly heterogeneous. Larger numbers of students from non-White and low income backgrounds were enrolling. Accordingly, students, faculty and staff were all facing many of the challenges that confront other changing communities—social, economic and demographic trends that continue to reshape the face of California.

In Spring 1987 Student Affairs Research and Information (SARI) surveyed UC Davis students regarding their perceptions of various areas of student life. Among the reports to come out of that survey, *The Davis Social Environment: A Report of Student Opinions* (August 1988) revealed that students were, for the most part, well satisfied with the campus' social environment. But satisfaction levels varied considerably among ethnic groups: Black students were less satisfied than undergraduates overall with most aspects of the social environment, Whites and Asians were generally the most satisfied, while Chicanos fell in the middle.

Between 1987 and 1990 campus expansion and diversification proceeded apace. Undergraduate enrollments grew 20% from Fall 1986 through Fall 1990, while the number of non-White undergraduates increased 44%. Student demonstrations shifted their emphasis from social repression in South Africa to discrimination and cultural exclusion on campus. And in Spring 1990, both academic departments and student services—many of them already understaffed and underfunded—began to face the growing likelihood of budgetary cuts.

In this environment of stressful change, SARI once again surveyed undergraduates, asking their opinions about campus life in order to answer these questions:

1) With which aspects of the social environment of the Davis campus are undergraduates most—and least— satisfied?
2) How do Davis undergraduates compare with their national peers?
3) How do undergraduates in 1990 differ from those of 1987?
4) Do there continue to be differences in satisfaction among racial/ethnic groups?

Results from the 1990 Student Opinion Survey indicate that UC Davis undergraduates remain relatively satisfied with most aspects of the social environment of the campus. Furthermore, Davis students are more satisfied than their national peers with nearly all items included in the study. But student satisfaction declined broadly since 1987, notably for racial harmony and the degree to which students are treated as individuals. As was the case in 1987, Black students are less satisfied with most aspects of UC Davis' social environment, Whites and Asians are generally the most satisfied, and Chicanos fall between.

METHODOLOGY

In Spring 1990 Student Affairs Research and Information conducted a Student Opinion Survey of UC Davis undergraduates. The survey instrument, designed by the American College Testing Program (ACT), asked students to indicate their use of and to rate their satisfaction with a broad range of campus programs and services and to evaluate various aspects of the college environment. SARI added a set of 30 campus-specific questions asking students about their perceptions of various social problems on campus and about academic advising. An open-ended question also asked them to comment specifically on the strengths and weaknesses of their academic advising experience at Davis; many did, but a majority chose to comment on a wide range of other topics as well.

SARI drew a sample of 1,649 students from all continuing and returning undergraduates enrolled in Winter 1990, disproportionately stratified by ethnicity into four groups or strata: 192 Asians, 536 Blacks, 523 Chicanos, and 398 Whites and all other ethnicities.

On April 6, 1990, SARI mailed survey packets to the local addresses of the sample population. A week later SARI sent reminder postcards to the entire sample, followed by second survey packets to nonrespondents. In order to get a sufficient number of responses from Black students, who typically respond in much lower proportions than other groups, SARI sent a third survey packet to those Black students who had not responded. SARI accepted completed questionnaires through June 19, at which time all usable survey forms were shipped to ACT for processing.

The overall response rate was 57.7%; 951 of 1,649 students returned usable questionnaires. Response rates by ethnic groups were: Asian, 67.2%; Black, 49.1%; Chicano, 57.2%; and White and all other, 65.3%.

Data for Davis respondents, with the exception of those for ethnic groups, have been weighted to compensate for the effects of disproportionate sampling. National norms, which are provided by ACT, were derived from a sample of colleges and universities with populations larger than 10,000 surveyed between January 1, 1987 and April 30, 1990.

SARI used analysis of variance to assess the statistical significance of differences in group means. We chose a confidence level of 95%, permitting us to say that, where differences between two groups of respondents are significant, there is at least a 95% chance that these differences exist within the whole undergraduate population. When comparing group means, we did not take into account the simultaneous effects of other variables. For example, in reporting means for ethnic groups, we did not take into account differences between the responses of men and women or differences by academic level.

This report examines 24 variables related to the social environment. When reading the report, keep in mind that the instrument was not designed for the primary purpose of gathering information about the social environment; thus, the operational definition of social environment is not comprehensive.

A fuller description of the survey methodology is available upon request from Student Affairs Research and Information. Tables A-1 through A-8 appear in the Appendix; tables for the remaining variables are available upon request.

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

UC Davis enjoys a national reputation for providing high-quality extracurricular activities for its students. By some estimates, its student clubs and organizations (over 250) provide about 60% of campus activity and social life. Cultural Days, Picnic Day, Whole Earth Festival and Disability Awareness Week further enrich students' social life. The campus also possesses one of the most successful intramural sports programs in the nation; the ACT survey shows that 77% of undergraduates participate in recreational and intramural programs.

Respondents to the 1990 survey are, in general, fairly satisfied with the extracurricular programs and services included in the study, especially recreational and intramural programs. Since 1987, satisfaction declined in three extracurricular activities, rose for one (cultural programs) and remained unchanged for another (religious activities and programs). Black students, despite active participation in extracurricular programs, are among the least satisfied with them; in particular, they are substantially less satisfied than other students with cultural programs.

The ACT survey instrument includes five questions that ask students about their satisfaction with activities associated with extracurricular life on the UC Davis campus. As shown in Table 1 below, respondents to the 1990 survey report levels of satisfaction ranging from a very high mean rating of 4.30 for recreational and intramural programs to a moderate satisfaction rating of 3.37 for religious activities and programs.

Table 1
Satisfaction With Extracurricular Activities
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

	UC Davis		National Norms	
Level of Satisfaction with:	1987	1990	1987	1990
Recreational & intramural programs	4.45	4.30*	4.12	4.16
Cultural programs	3.82	3.92	3.95	3.95
Opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities	3.82	3.79	3.65	3.62
UCD-sponsored social activities	3.81	3.78	3.74	3.71
Religious activities & programs	3.36	3.37	3.45	3.44

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UC Davis mean ratings is statistically significant (p<.05).*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

Satisfaction with recreational and intramural programs fell from an exceptionally high mean rating of 4.45 in 1987 to 4.30 in 1990. Because this difference is statistically significant *($F=12.78$, $p<.01$)*, we may infer a real decline in the satisfaction level of all undergraduates. Student satisfaction rose from 3.82 to 3.92 for cultural programs, stayed about the same for religious activities (3.36 to 3.37), and declined slightly for campus-sponsored social activities (3.81 to 3.78) and opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities (3.82 to 3.79); none of these differences is significant.

Respondents' comments offer no clues as to why satisfaction with recreational and intramural programs declined. Increased competition for limited resources (e.g., playing fields, weight rooms and equipment), resulting from substantial enrollment growth since 1987, provides one possible explanation.

Despite this drop in satisfaction, Davis respondents rate recreational and intramural programs substantially higher than respondents in the national norms (4.30 *versus* 4.16). This finding is not surprising, given UC Davis' strong commitment to recreational sports. The intramural sports program annually offers some 36 different activities in which approximately 13,200 students participate; the sports club program sponsors additional recreational and competitive offerings in 36 sports for over 1350 students.

ETHNIC GROUPS

Satisfaction with extracurricular activities varies considerably for 1990 respondents among the four ethnic groups, as shown in Table 2 (page following). Black respondents express the lowest levels of satisfaction with four of the extracurricular activities included in the study, while Whites report the highest levels with four activities. Chicano and Asian ratings generally fall between these points.

Black Students

Black respondents to the 1990 survey report the least satisfaction with most extracurricular activities. Despite very active participation in cultural programs (74% use this service, 19 percentage points higher than Chicanos, the next most active group), Black students are notably less satisfied than other students. They are also much less satisfied with campus-sponsored social activities (3.52) and with religious activities and programs (3.14). Differences between Black respondents and all other respondent groups for these three activities are statistically significant. A comment offered by a Black junior suggests that these lower levels of satisfaction may have more to do with the range of activities rather than their quality.

> [T]his school lacks one great thing—social life for Blacks! (minorities in general)! Being a mix of Black and White, I can appreciate both social needs and the needs are not provided for Blacks and other minorities.

Chicano Students

As in 1987, Chicano respondents to the 1990 survey express the highest level of satisfaction with recreational and intramural programs (4.33). They are also among the most satisfied with campus-sponsored social activities (3.79) and opportunities for personal involvement (3.73). Chicanos, however, report a relatively low level of satisfaction with religious activities and programs (3.26), considerably lower than in 1987 (3.50).

Table 2
Satisfaction with Extracurricular Activities
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Recreational & intramural programs.					
1987*	(4.45)	4.30	4.63	4.35	4.47
1990	(4.30)	4.26	4.33	4.31	4.30
Cultural programs					
1987	(3.82)	3.66	3.58	3.74	3.86
1990*	(3.92)	3.53	3.77	3.88	3.98
Opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities					
1987	(3.82)	3.55	3.71	3.78	3.85
1990*	(3.79)	3.64	3.73	3.62	3.85
UCD-sponsored social activities					
1987*	(3.81)	3.49	3.90	4.00	3.79
1990*	(3.78)	3.52	3.79	3.70	3.82
Religious activities & programs					
1987*	(3.36)	3.09	3.50	3.65	3.30
1990*	(3.37)	3.14	3.26	3.32	3.41

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean ($p<.05$).*

Asian Students

Asians are more satisfied than other students with some extracurricular activities and less with others. They report high levels of satisfaction with recreational and intramural programs (4.31) but somewhat less than other students with cultural programs (3.88), campus-sponsored social activities (3.70), and religious activities and programs (3.32). They are least satisfied with opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities (3.62). Satisfaction dropped considerably since 1987 for religious activities and programs (.33 of a mean rating point), campus-sponsored social activities (.30) and opportunities for personal involvement (.16).

White and All Other Students

White respondents to the 1990 survey are somewhat more satisfied than other groups with four extracurricular activities: cultural programs (3.98), opportunities for personal involvement (3.85), campus-sponsored social activities (3.82), and religious activities and programs (3.41). They are also among the most satisfied with recreational and intramural programs (4.30).

FOOD, HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION

Basic services, such as food, housing and transportation, provide essential elements of student life outside the classroom. The campus prides itself on having an outstanding residence life program, an adequate supply of student housing, and a top-notch mass transit system. Because UC Davis is a residential university, a large proportion of students live on or near the campus (about 90% of freshmen live in residence halls). And those who live beyond walking or bicycling distance can use an extensive student-operated transit system with eight bus routes throughout the city of Davis. The ACT questionnaire includes questions about student housing, food services, transportation and parking.

Survey results reveal that 1990 respondents are well satisfied with food, housing and college mass transit services, but quite dissatisfied with others, notably parking facilities and services. Satisfaction ratings declined since 1987 for all services in this category except availability of student housing. Black students express the lowest levels of satisfaction with basic services offered on campus, while Asians and Whites report the highest.

As data in Table 3 indicate, respondents to the 1990 survey are highly satisfied with college mass transit services (4.15) but not with parking facilities and services, which received a very low satisfaction rating (2.20). Respondents give fairly high mean ratings to the availability of student housing (3.75) and residence hall services and programs (3.66); but they are only moderately satisfied with food services on campus (3.30).

Table 3
Satisfaction With Food, Housing and Transportation
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

	UC Davis		National Norms	
Level of Satisfaction with:	1987	1990	1987	1990
College mass transit services	4.25	4.15	3.67	3.67
Availability of student housing	3.76	3.75	3.36	3.18
Residence hall services & programs	3.75	3.66	3.61	3.56
Food services	3.43	3.30*	3.16	3.25
Parking facilities & services	2.32	2.20	2.42	2.20

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UC Davis mean ratings is statistically significant (p<.05).*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

Although satisfaction ratings remained unchanged for availability of student housing, they declined for the other four basic services. Only for food services, however, is the difference statistically significant *($F=5.06$, $p<.02$)*. Moreover, the Davis trend runs counter to the national norms; mean satisfaction with food services dropped .13 of a rating point for Davis students during this period but rose .09 for students in the national norms.

When students rate their satisfaction with food services, we do not know which of the many campus eating areas they are rating. As indicated by their written comments, however, they generally praise the student-run Coffee House:

> The Coffee House is great!

and find considerable fault with the residence hall dining commons (D.C.):

> I'm very dissatisfied with the D.C. food; sometimes I lose my appetite on the first bite. The D.C. food has to be improved. I'm thinking about returning to the residence hall next year but I don't know if I should because of the D.C. food.

> [T]here are times when the food is so bad, horrible, we as students can only eat cereal. We are paying so much money for food that we ... should be served at least a good warm meal at least twice a week.

Table A-1 in the Appendix reveals that freshmen, the primary users of the residence hall dining commons, rate food services considerably lower than other students (3.07 *versus* 3.31 for sophomores, 3.38 for juniors and 3.44 for seniors). Similar differences appear also in the 1987 study. Much of this dissatisfaction may be due to the fact that most freshmen are experiencing their first encounter with a steady diet of institutional food.

On-going construction and remodeling projects in the Memorial Union and Silo may also have contributed to the overall decline in satisfaction with food services. Two food services closed in the months prior to the survey—the Last Resort Pub & Restaurant at the Memorial Union in December 1989 and the eating area at the Silo in March 1990. Although the campus established temporary food service areas, these may not be as satisfying to students as the areas they replaced.

While the decline in satisfaction with parking facilities and services is not statistically significant, this particular area stands out as a major annoyance and inconvenience for students. Among the many respondent comments, several themes emerge, most of which center on the need for more parking. Said a freshman:

> If the University cannot expand parking as the student body expands, then UC Davis has no business expanding the student body.

Another respondent complained about residence hall parking:

> Residential housing parking in Cuarto area by Webster Hall needs to be improved—it's ridiculous that [you] have to park three to four blocks away if you move your car.

And a junior had this to say about insufficient student parking:

> There is too much "A" parking and not enough "C" parking. If we pay for a permit we should be able to find a space. There are always open spaces in "A" lots.

Students also complain about high parking costs:

> The fees for the parking permits have dramatically increased—for what? I see no additional lots—except for the ones far from the campus!! Why not have some space by the MU where the faculty parks! I think that the increase of fees is just unfair.

> The parking meters are ridiculously overpriced. A lot of students can't afford parking stickers and there is no off-campus parking available for over 2 hours.

The managers of campus parking can take some comfort in the fact that Davis undergraduates rate parking facilities and services equal to the national norms (2.20). And those who provide other basic services should be very encouraged that Davis undergraduates report higher levels of satisfaction than appear in the national norms. For example, Davis students are significantly more satisfied than their national peers with college mass transit services (4.15 *versus* 3.67) and with the availability of student housing (3.75 *versus* 3.18). They are also more satisfied with residence hall services and programs (3.66 *versus* 3.56).

ETHNIC GROUPS

Table 4 reveals that Black respondents to the 1990 study express the lowest levels of satisfaction with basic services offered on campus, while Asians and Whites report the highest. Chicanos are more satisfied with some services and less satisfied with others. Since 1987, satisfaction with food services, mass transit and parking declined among all four ethnic groups.

Black Students

Black students express the least satisfaction with all services included in this section; but only in two areas—food services and availability of student housing—are differences among ethnic groups statistically significant *($F=3.22, p<.02$; and $F=6.28, p<.01$, respectively)*. Tables A-1 and A-2 in the Appendix show that 29% of 1990 Black respondents are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with food services and 19% with the availability of student housing. Table 4 (page following) also shows that Black students' satisfaction with food services dropped from 3.28 (1987) to 3.04 (1990), a considerable decline. Their satisfaction with the availability of student housing also fell substantially, going from 3.74 to 3.43.

Chicano Students

Chicanos, along with the other three ethnic groups, are well satisfied with residence hall services and programs (3.66 *versus* 3.64 for Blacks and 3.67 for Asians and Whites). They are, however, fairly unhappy with food services; according to Table A-1 in the Appendix, 28% of Chicano respondents to the 1990 survey said they are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with campus food services. Since 1987, their level of satisfaction with food services dropped from 3.30 to 3.16. Satisfaction with college mass transit also dropped, from 4.26 to 4.08.

Black and Chicano respondents did not offer any comments that explain their fairly high levels of dissatisfaction with food services (29% and 28% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, respectively).

Table 4
Satisfaction With Food, Housing and Transportation
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
College mass transit services					
1987	(4.25)	4.08	4.26	4.38	4.23
1990	(4.15)	4.02	4.08	4.07	4.18
Availability of student housing					
1987	(3.76)	3.74	3.69	3.88	3.74
1990*	(3.75)	3.43	3.68	3.68	3.79
Residence hall services & programs					
1987	(3.75)	3.64	3.61	3.77	3.76
1990	(3.66)	3.64	3.66	3.67	3.67
Food services					
1987	(3.43)	3.28	3.30	3.47	3.44
1990*	(3.30)	3.04	3.16	3.31	3.32
Parking facilities & services					
1987	(2.32)	2.22	2.18	2.47	2.30
1990	(2.20)	2.08	2.14	2.42	2.15

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean ($p<.05$).*

Asian Students

Similar to other students, Asians are fairly dissatisfied with food services (3.31), although somewhat less so. Between 1987 and 1990 their level of satisfaction with food services fell from 3.47 to 3.31. Asian satisfaction with two other basic services also dropped substantially: availability of student housing (from 3.88 to 3.68) and college mass transit (from 4.38 to 4.07).

White and All Other Students

Whites are relatively more satisfied than other ethnic subgroups with college mass transit (4.18), availability of student housing (3.79), residence hall services (3.67) and food services (3.32). They are among the least satisfied with parking facilities and services (2.15); since 1987, their satisfaction declined with both parking and food services (.15 and .12 of a mean rating point, respectively).

SOCIAL INTERACTIONS ON CAMPUS

In order to feel a part of the campus community, students must develop and maintain satisfactory social relationships with faculty, staff and fellow students. Survey findings reveal mixed levels of student satisfaction with the four items from the ACT survey instrument that measure social interactions on the campus. Although well satisfied with the attitude of faculty toward students, r ondents in 1990 are very dissatisfied with racial harmony at UC Davis and with the degree of concern shown for the student as an individual. Furthermore, satisfaction with racial harmony dropped substantially since 1987, as did concern for the student as an individual, although to a lesser degree. Black students are less satisfied than other students with all aspects of social interaction on campus, especially racial harmony.

Table 5 shows mean satisfaction ratings with social interactions on campus for respondents to the 1990 survey. Undergraduates express a fairly high level of satisfaction with the attitude of faculty toward students (3.83) and a moderate level of satisfaction with the attitude of nonteaching staff toward students (3.41). But respondents report low levels of satisfaction with racial harmony (3.08) and concern for the student as an individual (2.98).

Table 5
Satisfaction With Social Interactions on Campus
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

	UC Davis		National Norms	
Level of Satisfaction with:	1987	1990	1987	1990
Attitude of faculty toward students	3.75	3.83	3.81	3.81
Attitude of nonteaching staff toward students	3.43	3.41	3.30	3.33
Racial harmony at UC Davis	3.39	3.08*	3.44	3.38
Concern for student as an individual	3.19	2.98*	3.11	3.12

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UC Davis mean ratings is statistically significant ($p<.05$).*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

In 1990 student satisfaction increased slightly with the attitude of faculty toward students and decreased slightly with the attitude of nonteaching staff toward students, but neither change is statistically significant. Not so for satisfaction with racial harmony or concern for the student as an individual, however; both dropped substantially and significantly *($F=28.49$, $p=<.01$ and $F=14.56$, $p=<.01$, respectively).*

Davis students also express significantly less satisfaction than their national counterparts with racial harmony (3.08 *versus* 3.38) and concern for the student as an individual (2.98 *versus* 3.12). Although the satisfaction rating for racial harmony also dropped since 1987 for those in the national norms (from 3.44 to 3.38), this decline is considerably smaller than that for Davis undergraduates.

There are undoubtedly many reasons why Davis students appear to be so very dissatisfied with these two critical areas of social interaction. The low rating given racial harmony on campus should be partially understood within the following context:

The Student Opinion Survey took place during in Spring 1990, a time of considerable student activism. Students had organized a number of demonstrations protesting racism during both Winter and Spring, culminating in a hunger strike. The strikers and their supporters issued several specific demands, including establishment of a cross-cultural center on campus; the strike ended with the administration agreeing to provide a location and funding for the center. Given the frequency and intensity of political activity at this time, it is very possible that the opinions measured by the survey are atypical or exaggerated.

Students' opinions may also be influenced by increased attention of the national media to racial conflicts on college campuses. During the past three years, confrontations between students of different races and backgrounds frequently made the news. It is not clear whether this coverage reflects an actual increase in the number of incidents during this period or simply more diligence in reporting such conflicts, but the result may be the same—a heightened awareness among college students of racial tensions on campuses.

In a similar vein, undergraduates may be more sensitive to racial issues due to recent campus activities intended to foster diversity. In the months prior to and during the period the survey was distributed, UC Davis developed and filled a new assistant vice chancellor position responsible for campus diversity, adopted a "Principles of Community" statement establishing norm of behavior related to discrimination, and continued discussions regarding the creation of an ethnic studies requirement.

The low mean rating for concern for the student as an individual contrasts sharply with the image the campus has traditionally sought to foster—a supportive, hospitable environment for undergraduates. The College Experiences Study project, a national study conducted in 1988-89, selected UC Davis as one of 14 colleges and universities in the country that offer undergraduates an exceptional out-of-class experience. According to the study, Davis is known for its "human scale," "spirit of place," and "sense of community."[1]

The erosion in satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual may likely be related in part to rapid growth and overcrowding on campus during the past few years. Evidence abounds: students pack the lounges and eating areas, wait in long lines to receive service, and jam streets and pathways with bicycles, to mention but a few easily observable circumstances. Add problems associated with understaffed departments, crowded classrooms and increased competition for certain courses and the net result may well be an increasing number of students who feel that campus personnel do not care about them.

ETHNIC GROUPS

A familiar pattern emerges when student satisfaction levels are examined by ethnicity: Black students are least satisfied with all facets of social interaction on campus, particularly racial harmony. Other ethnic groups express satisfaction levels fairly similar to one another on each social interaction item, with the exception of a relatively low rating given to racial harmony by Chicano respondents.

Table 6
Satisfaction With Social Interactions on Campus
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Attitude of faculty toward students					
1987	(3.75)	3.50	3.77	3.92	3.73
1990*	(3.83)	3.54	3.74	3.84	3.85
Attitude of nonteaching staff toward students					
1987	(3.43)	3.28	3.40	3.36	3.45
1990	(3.41)	3.34	3.45	3.37	3.43
Racial harmony at UC Davis					
1987*	(3.39)	2.45	3.08	3.58	3.41
1990*	(3.08)	2.20	2.69	3.24	3.12
Concern for student as an individual					
1987	(3.19)	3.01	3.20	3.29	3.17
1990*	(2.98)	2.81	3.04	3.09	2.95

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean ($p<.05$).*

Black Students

Black respondents to the 1990 survey register the least satisfaction with all items in this section. For three items the differences among ethnic groups are statistically significant: attitude of the faculty toward students *($F=5.74$ $p<.01$)*, racial harmony on campus *($F=46.03$, $p<.01$)* and concern for the student as an individual *($F=3.24$, $p<.02$)*. Table 6 above shows that Blacks give racial harmony a disturbingly low satisfaction rating (2.20); this is .88 of a rating point below the mean for all undergraduates (3.08) and .39 below Chicanos (2.69), the next least satisfied group. Table A-3 in the Appendix further reveals that the proportion of Black students dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with racial harmony rose from 51% in 1987 to 64% in 1990.

Black students commented extensively on the racial climate; their comments cluster around three themes. First, many perceive that UC Davis has a major racial problem; consequently, they feel socially isolated and uncomfortable. A senior wrote:

> As an African-American, the overall atmosphere of UCD is racist. The White students, faculty and administrators made me feel excluded from the Davis campus experience. Throughout my five years here at UCD, I felt unaccepted, not a part of, and excluded from mainstream campus life.

Second, several Black respondents express concern that campus administrators talk about racial diversity but do nothing to change the campus climate:

> I'm tired of the lack of action the university has taken on the racism on campus. UC Davis pledges diversity, but tolerates racial intolerance. If you don't want to deal with the issues of the shanty and ethnic studies requirement, don't give the students who really care the runaround. Making big speeches at the quad isn't enough. Minority students are tired of empty promises and intentions.

And third, Black respondents offer several solutions to racial problems on campus, such as increasing minority student enrollment, hiring more minority faculty, implementing an Ethnic Studies requirement for all students and creating a cross-cultural center. Said a sophomore:

> Increase minority enrollment! Thereafter, make the minority students feel welcome and an essential part of the university.

A junior suggests:

> There should be more University-funded programs to promote interracial understanding. Courses like Afro-American Studies 123 (Racial Ethnicity) should be a two-part class offered every quarter to allow a greater opportunity for student involvement. I also think that there should be some sort of requirement for ethnic studies being part of GE.

Black students also report a much lower level of satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual (2.81), a finding that possibly reflects not only their strong dissatisfaction with racial harmony at Davis but the effects of campus growth and crowding (e.g., limited space for student organization meetings). They additionally give the lowest satisfaction ratings to the attitude of nonteaching staff (3.34) and faculty toward students (3.54).

Chicano Students

While more satisfied than Black students with their social interactions at Davis, Chicano students also rate racial harmony on this campus very low (2.69), a drop of .39 of a mean rating point. Reference to Table A-3 in the Appendix shows that Chicano satisfaction with racial harmony dropped from 40% satisfied or very satisfied in 1987 to only 26% in 1990, a substantial decline.

Comments written by Chicano respondents, similar to Blacks, call attention to racial problems on the Davis campus:

> The racial problem that is growing should be dealt with immediately, before it gets out of hand. I'm referring to the way Mexican/Americans as well as Blacks are treated.

criticize the administration's efforts to deal with these problems:

> This is a very good college yet the administration needs to handle racial awareness more gracefully than it has been. Educators know about the problems, yet those who have the power to change things seem to be blind to the situation.

and offer solutions:

> I think a lot of racial tension could be alleviated if a general education requirement for an Ethnic Studies class is instituted: I know that education and open discussion is the key.

Chicano respondents to the 1990 survey hold opinions similar to undergraduates overall regarding satisfaction with the attitude of the faculty toward students (3.74 *versus* 3.83), the attitude of nonteaching staff toward students (3.45 *versus* 3.41) and concern for the student as an individual (3.04 *versus* 2.98).

Asian Students

Asian respondents give both racial harmony and concern for the student as an individual the highest satisfaction ratings of any ethnic group. Yet a closer look at the data reveals a steep decline since 1987 in satisfaction ratings, falling from 3.58 to 3.24 for racial harmony and from 3.29 to 3.09 for concern for the student as an individual. Data on Tables A-3 and A-4 in the Appendix supports these findings: the proportion of Asian respondents satisfied or very satisfied with racial harmony dropped from 65% to 42%, while concern for the student as an individual fell from 47% to 31%. Their comments provide no explanation as to why Asian students are less satisfied with these two aspects of social interaction.

Asians remain fairly satisfied with the attitude of the faculty toward students (3.84) and moderately satisfied with the attitude of the nonteaching staff toward students (3.37).

White and All Other Students

White students are among the most satisfied with the attitude of both faculty and nonteaching staff toward students; but their satisfaction with racial harmony falls below that of Asians, while satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual is lower than that of Asians and Chicanos. Similar to other ethnic groups, White students' satisfaction with racial harmony declined substantially between 1987 (3.41) and 1990 (3.12). Satisfaction with concern for the student as an individual dropped as well, from 3.17 to 2.95.

Their comments indicate that White respondents are well aware of the existence of racial problems on the Davis campus. Some respondents are sensitive to the effects of racial intolerance:

> Minorities on campus are feeling oppressed and alienated. Special attention needs to be paid to increasing understanding between minorities and the rest of the campus.... When talking to a friend, I was surprised to find what forms prejudice could take. I think if people were more aware of what they are doing to upset others, perhaps unknowingly, they'd be better able to avoid upsetting a fellow student and human.

and support the University's affirmative action programs;

> We have very far to go with our affirmative action programs, but we are moving in the right direction.

But other respondents express opposition to certain aspects of these programs:

> I also have a problem with all the special treatment that "ethnic" students receive. Why are they allowed special free tutors, or given priorities for admittance. Everyone is here to learn—so unless someone has something physically wrong that requires special help (i.e., blind, deaf, etc.), I don't believe special privileges should be given. What ever happened to equality for all?

And some respondents react to minority student activism on the campus:

> In reference to racial problems at UC Davis, I feel that a problem exists not in the majority tolerating the minorities, but in the minorities tolerating the majority. Too much activism exists on the part of minorities perceiving racial prejudice.

These comments point up a challenge facing the campus: to create a community not only culturally diverse but harmonious as well. As described in *Involving Colleges*, the campus—where one-third of students are people of color—has already made considerable progress in moving toward a multicultural environment. And yet, the authors caution, "[UC Davis has] faced and will continue to face difficult times as students attempt to learn how to live with and learn from people who are different from themselves."[2]

The task of becoming a harmonious multicultural community may be made even more difficult by recent cuts in the State and University budgets. Troy Duster, director of the Institute for the Study of Social Change at UC Berkeley, emphasizes the economic dimensions of this issue. Duster, who has studied racial and ethnic tensions on campuses, says that racial tensions "are a result of competition for scarce resources—ranging from who receives financial aid to who controls the type of music played on the campus radio station. The competition has grown hotter because more and more new players—minority students—have been coming onto the field and demanding to play the game." The situation will improve over time, Duster predicts, but not soon.[3]

---

[1]Kuh, George D., et al. "Institutional Case Analysis Summary, University of California, Davis." (College Experiences Study Project). Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, 1989.

[2]Kuh, George D., et al. *Involving Colleges: Successful Approaches to Fostering Student Learning and Development Outside the Classroom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1991.

[3]"Racial Tensions Continue to Erupt on Campuses Despite Efforts to Promote Cultural Diversity," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 6, 1990).

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: INTOLERANCE

The survey includes a set of campus-developed questions to measure students' perceptions of the seriousness of nine social problems; these problems, which occur at many colleges, cluster around three themes: intolerance, health and safety. Using a scale ranging from 1 = Not a Problem to 4 = Serious Problem, the questions ask students to indicate, based on their observations and experience, how much of a problem each area is for UC Davis students. Note that the higher the mean score, the more serious the problem. Because these questions are specific to this campus, there are no national norms against which to compare Davis responses.

This section examines four aspects of intolerance on campus. The findings reveal that students perceive race (2.24) as the most serious of these intolerance issues and disability (1.60) the least. Students in 1990 register more concern than those in 1987 with all areas of intolerance, particularly racial. Black students, and Chicanos to a lesser extent, perceive each area of intolerance as more of a problem for Davis students than do Asian or White students.

Table 7
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Intolerance
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is:	1987	1990	Change 1987-90
Intolerance: race	1.89	2.24*	+.35
Intolerance: homosexuality	2.02	2.14*	+.12
Intolerance: foreign origin	1.86	1.90	+.04
Intolerance: disability	1.43	1.60*	+.17

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UCD mean ratings is statistically significant at p<.05.*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

Students surveyed in 1990 rate all four areas of intolerance on campus as more of a problem for Davis students than did their 1987 counterparts. Furthermore, the differences between mean ratings are statistically significant for three areas of intolerance: race *(F=40.32, p<.01)*, disability *(F=15.80, p<.01)* and homosexuality *(F=4.80, p<.03)*.

Table 7 (previous page) shows that the mean rating for racial intolerance rose from 1.89 to 2.24, an increase of .35 of a mean rating point—a very substantial difference. The size and direction of this difference are consistent with the large decline in satisfaction with racial harmony on campus reported in the previous section. Table A-5 in the Appendix provides additional evidence of increased concern about racial intolerance: the proportion of respondents who ranked racial intolerance as a moderate or serious problem grew from 26% to 38%.

Respondents also report that other areas of intolerance are now more serious problems for Davis students. Between 1987 and 1990, the mean rating for intolerance of disability increased .17 of a rating point, intolerance of homosexuality went up .12, and intolerance of foreign origin .04.

What caused this increase in respondents' level of concern for all four indicators of intolerance on campus? Is intolerance truly more of a problem than in 1987 or are students now more sensitive to all forms of intolerance? Perhaps both are true; while we cannot rule out the former, these comments support the latter:

> I suggest that more money be allocated to educating the mostly ignorant student body about race, disability, foreign origin, homosexuality, etc.
>
> Of the three years I've been here so far, the racial tension has definitely increased as well as dissatisfaction from women, gays/lesbians, and disabled students.
>
> At this school, some people are completely ignorant as to the history and culture of other races. This ignorance only breeds racism because racism comes out of ignorance. What better place to learn than the university environment. UC Davis also needs classes on such things as homosexuality—another ignored minority. People need to learn about each other as well as alternative lifestyles, that people are all different and unique and special.

ETHNIC GROUPS

There exists a striking disparity among ethnic groups regarding their perceptions of intolerance on the Davis campus. Black students especially, but Chicanos as well, are considerably more likely than Asians and Whites to rate as serious the problem areas used in this study to assess intolerance (Table 8, page following).

The four ethnic groups follow a similar pattern, rating race as the most serious intolerance problem for Davis students, followed by homosexuality, foreign origin and disability.

Black Students

As was the case in 1987, Black respondents currently report the greatest levels of concern among the four ethnic groups on each measure of intolerance. They perceive race (3.23) as the most serious area of intolerance, followed by homosexuality (2.60), foreign origin (2.25) and disability (1.99). Differences between Blacks and other student groups are statistically significant for all four issues. Of particular concern is the sharp increase in the proportion of Black students who feel that racial intolerance is a serious problem—growing from 28% to 49% (Table A-5 in Appendix). These findings support those presented in the previous section regarding racial harmony: both show that Black students are, as a group, deeply dissatisfied with the racial climate on the Davis campus.

Table 8
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Intolerance
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Race					
1987*	(1.89)	2.84	2.20	1.75	1.85
1990*	(2.24)	3.23	2.70	2.12	2.18
Homosexuality					
1987*	(2.02)	2.51	2.04	2.02	2.00
1990*	(2.14)	2.60	2.35	2.04	2.13
Foreign origin					
1987*	(1.86)	2.27	2.06	1.85	1.83
1990*	(1.90)	2.25	2.20	1.95	1.85
Disability					
1987*	(1.43)	1.88	1.59	1.46	1.40
1990*	(1.60)	1.99	1.69	1.50	1.60

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean ($p<.05$).*

Chicano Students

While less concerned than Blacks, Chicano respondents to the 1990 survey are more concerned than Asians and Whites about intolerance on the Davis campus. They give the following mean ratings to intolerance issues, from most to least serious: race (2.70), homosexuality (2.35), foreign origin (2.20) and disability (1.69).

Chicanos report increased levels of concern since 1987 for three areas of intolerance. The proportion who perceive racial intolerance as a serious problem more than doubled, from 11% to 28% (Table A-5, Appendix); those who perceive intolerance of homosexuality as a serious problem rose from 6% to 15% (Table A-6, Appendix); and those who perceive intolerance of foreign origin as a serious problem went from 10% to 15% (Table A-7, Appendix). Some of this heightened concern about intolerance on campus may well be related to well-publicized charges of racism leveled at the Spanish Department by a group of Chicano students; the issue was under intense discussion at the time of the survey and emotions ran high.

Asian Students

Like their 1987 counterparts, Asian respondents to the 1990 survey consider the issues used to measure intolerance on campus as less serious for Davis students than do Black and Chicano students. But unlike the 1987 Asian respondents who rated intolerance of homosexuality as the most serious problem among these issues, respondents now consider race (2.12) the most serious intolerance problem, followed by homosexuality (2.04), foreign origin (1.95) and disability (1.50).

White and All Other Students

Similar to Asians, White students are less likely to rate as serious problems these measures of campus intolerance. Their mean ratings for intolerance issues are: race (2.18), homosexuality (2.13), foreign origin (1.85) and disability (1.60).

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: HEALTH ISSUES

This section examines Davis undergraduates' perceptions of the seriousness of three health issues that concern college students—alcohol abuse, drug abuse and sexually transmitted diseases.

Most American colleges and universities consider alcohol abuse a major health problem facing undergraduates today. According to a recent national survey conducted by the National Institute on Drug Abuse, 43% of full-time college students engage in occasions of heavy drinking (five or more drinks in a row within the past two weeks) *versus* 36% of their noncollege peers.[4]

Not surprisingly, respondents to the 1990 survey single out alcohol abuse as the most serious health issue included in this study. In fact, they perceive alcohol abuse as the most serious social problem of those listed in the survey (including racial intolerance). Students' level of concern regarding alcohol abuse and drug abuse on campus dropped slightly since 1987, while sexually transmitted diseases was perceived as somewhat more of a problem. Among ethnic groups, Black students express the highest levels of concern for each of these health problems; Asians, the lowest.

As seen in Table 9 below, respondents to the 1990 survey identify alcohol abuse (2.62) as a moderately serious problem for students on the Davis campus. Table A-8 in the Appendix provides further detail: 58% of respondents say that alcohol abuse is a moderate or serious problem for Davis students. Drug abuse (1.86) and sexually transmitted diseases (1.81) are considered more minor problems.

Table 9
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Health Issues
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is:	1987	1990	Change 1987-90
Alcohol abuse	2.67	2.62	-.05
Drug abuse	1.89	1.86	-.03
Sexually transmitted diseases	1.73	1.81	+.08

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UCD mean ratings is statistically significant at p<.05.*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

Although 1990 respondents regard alcohol abuse and drug abuse as slightly less serious and sexually transmitted diseases slightly more serious problems than did respondents in 1987, none of these differences are large enough to infer similar differences among all undergraduates. The modest decline in concern about alcohol and drug abuse may be linked with increasing public awareness of the adverse social and health consequences associated with the misuse of alcohol and drugs. Increased concern about sexually transmitted diseases, on the other hand, may be related to a generalized concern about AIDS, but more specifically to widespread publicity regarding the growing risk among college age students.

ETHNIC GROUPS

In both 1990 and 1987, Black respondents are most likely and Asians least likely to rate as serious problems for Davis students the three measures of health on Table 10. White and Chicano respondents fall between the other two groups. All four ethnic groups rate alcohol abuse as the most serious of these health issues.

Table 10
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Health Issues
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Alcohol abuse					
1987*	(2.67)	2.99	2.70	2.42	2.70
1990*	(2.62)	3.01	2.70	2.53	2.63
Drug abuse					
1987*	(1.89)	2.15	2.01	1.60	1.93
1990*	(1.86)	2.02	1.99	1.79	1.86
Sexually transmitted diseases					
1987	(1.73)	1.77	1.90	1.63	1.74
1990*	(1.81)	2.00	1.96	1.69	1.83

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean ($p<.05$).*

Black Students

Black respondents are significantly more concerned than all other students with each health issue: alcohol abuse *($F=10.50$, $p<.01$)*, drug abuse *($F=3.41$, $p<.02$)* and sexually transmitted diseases *($F=4.49$, $p<.01$)*.

Although Blacks identify alcohol abuse as the most serious of these problems, there is virtually no difference between 1987 and 1990 in their level of concern regarding this issue (2.99 *versus* 3.01). They

show, however, a moderate decrease in their concern about drug abuse (2.15 *versus* 2.02) and a fairly large increase in concern about sexually transmitted diseases (1.77 *versus* 2.00). Increased concern about sexually transmitted diseases among Black students may be related to reports in the media that Blacks are disproportionately represented among AIDS victims.

Chicano Students

Chicano respondents to the 1990 survey report levels of concern for drug abuse and sexually transmitted diseases similar to those of Black respondents. Although less concerned than Black students with alcohol abuse, Chicanos nonetheless consider it the most serious of these health problems.

Perceptions of the seriousness of alcohol and drug abuse remain the same between 1987 and 1990 for Chicano students—2.70 for both years for alcohol abuse and 2.01 *versus* 1.99 for drug abuse. Concern with sexually transmitted diseases, however, rose from 1.90 to 1.96.

Asian Students

Among ethnic groups, Asian respondents are least likely to rate as serious problems the health measures included in this study. Similar to other groups, Asians rate alcohol abuse as the top health problem for the campus.

Compared to their 1987 counterparts, Asian respondents to the 1990 survey express greater levels of concern for all three health issues. Concern about drug abuse increased the most (from 1.60 to 1.79), compared with alcohol abuse (2.42 to 2.53) and sexually transmitted diseases (1.63 to 1.69).

White and All Other Students

White students fall in the middle of all ethnic groups when it comes to rating the seriousness of campus health problems. Consistent with other groups, they rate alcohol abuse as the most serious health problem.

Since 1987, White students' level of concern for alcohol and drug abuse diminished somewhat while concern for sexually transmitted diseases increased slightly. Changes were: alcohol abuse, 2.70 to 2.63; drug abuse, 1.93 to 1.86; and sexually transmitted diseases, 1.74 to 1.83.

---

[4]Johnson, Lloyd, et al. *Drug Use, Drinking, and Smoking: National Survey Results from High School, College, and Young Adults Populations, 1975-1988*. (DHHS Publication No. ADM 89-163). Washington, D.C.: National Institute on Drug Abuse, U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse & Mental Health Administration.

CAMPUS SOCIAL PROBLEMS: PERSONAL SECURITY & SAFETY

According to the College Experiences Study mentioned earlier, "Davis is one of the few remaining 'college towns' in the California system and most students go there to live the life of a residential student in a 'safe place.'"[5] Three items from the Student Opinion Survey asked respondents about personal security and safety on the Davis campus, one in the ACT instrument (Table 11) and two in the campus-developed questions (Table 12). When comparing the tables below, recall that the ACT instrument uses a five-point scale (1 = Very Dissatisfied to 5 = Very Satisfied), whereas the campus-developed questions use a four-point scale (1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem).

Survey results indicate that Davis students in 1990 are substantially more concerned about all three measures of personal security and safety on campus than were students in 1987. Despite this change, they are still moderately satisfied with personal security/safety on this campus (3.49), while neither sexual harassment (2.03) nor assaults on students (1.89) is perceived as a serious problem for Davis students. Black students stand out as most concerned about campus safety; Chicano, Asian and White students express lower but similar levels of concern.

Table 11
Satisfaction With Personal Security & Safety on Campus
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

	UC Davis		National Norms	
Level of Satisfaction with:	1987	1990	1987	1990
Personal security/safety on this campus	3.80	3.49*	3.45	3.40

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UC Davis mean ratings is statistically significant (p<.05).*

Table 12
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Safety Issues
All Undergraduates
—in mean ratings—

How Much of a Problem for UC Davis Students is:	1987	1990	Change 1987-90
Sexual harassment	1.80	2.03*	+.23
Assaults on students	1.69	1.89*	+.20

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** Difference between 1987 and 1990 UCD mean ratings is statistically significant at p<.05.*

CHANGES 1987 TO 1990

As illustrated in the tables above, respondents to the survey now perceive UC Davis as less safe than did respondents in the past. Differences in opinions of 1987 and 1990 students are statistically significant for all three measures: personal security/safety on this campus *($F=30.20$, $p<.01$)*, sexual harassment *($F=23.04$, $p<.01$)* and assaults on students *($F=17.59$, $p<.01$)*.

Respondents who commented about safety issues were primarily concerned about campus lighting, bicycle accidents and thefts, and rape prevention. Women, in particular, feel less safe on campus at night.

> Unfortunately it is not safe to be out alone at night, particularly if you are female. I know that many of us felt uncomfortable walking to our vehicles after dark, on the not very well lit roads of campus.

Increased concern about personal safety, as expressed by this junior, may very well be related to expansion of the class schedule to include early morning and evening classes.

> More lighting is needed now that there's the push for evening classes due to increase in student body.

Respondents did not comment directly about sexual harassment or assaults on students, but several expressed concern about rape and the need for rape prevention measures; for example:

> Rape is the shame of this campus.

> Chancellor Hullar ... needs to concentrate on serious problems like ... rape prevention.

Despite students' increased concern for their personal safety on campus, increases in UC Davis crime rates are, in general, commensurate with campus growth during this period. Between 1986 and 1989, the student population grew by 24%; however, property crime, which includes burglary, arson and theft (e.g., motor vehicles and bicycles), increased by only 14%, lower than the campus growth rate. Other less major offenses, such as vandalism, simple assaults, and driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, increased by 26%, proportionate with campus growth. The number of violent crimes rose from 5 to 12, primarily due to an increase (from 3 to 9) in the number of aggravated assaults.

During the past year or so, there has been a great deal of publicity regarding crime on college campuses and requests for disclosure of campus crime statistics. The California State Legislature recently passed legislation requiring all colleges and universities to report crime statistics to incoming students. There may be a relationship between publicity about campus crime and increased concern about personal security and safety on campus.

Similarly, increased concern about sexual harassment may reflect the University's success in raising the awareness of students, faculty and staff about sexual harassment rather than indicating a greater incidence of this activity on campus. Beginning in 1988, the campus revised its sexual harassment policy to improve the rights of victims and alleged harassers, developed an early intervention model that uses peer advisers to mediate and conciliate complaints, and created a sexual education program to strengthen education efforts.

ETHNIC GROUPS

Black respondents to the 1990 survey stand out as least satisfied with personal security and safety on campus and most concerned with assaults on students and with sexual harassment. Chicano, Asian and White respondents, for the most part, give fairly similar ratings on these measures of campus safety.

As discussed earlier, comparisons made in this report do not take into consideration the effects of other variables. In this section, however, it appears that gender may have an effect. Accordingly, when reading the findings in this section, keep in mind the fact that women are substantially more concerned than men with all aspects of campus safety.

Table 13
Satisfaction With Personal Security & Safety on Campus
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Personal security/safety on campus					
1987	(3.80)	3.71	3.77	3.83	3.80
1990*	(3.49)	3.32	3.56	3.53	3.49

Mean Ratings are based on a 5-point scale in which 1 = Very Dissatisfied and 5 = Very Satisfied.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean (p<.05).*

Table 14
Perceptions of Campus Social Problems: Safety Issues
by Ethnic Group
—in mean ratings—

	Overall Mean	Black	Chicano	Asian	White/ Other
Sexual harassment					
1987	(1.80)	1.85	1.89	1.67	1.82
1990*	(2.04)	2.23	2.04	1.94	2.05
Assaults on students					
1987	(1.69)	1.83	1.76	1.73	1.67
1990	(1.89)	2.05	1.88	1.85	1.89

Mean ratings are based on a 4-point scale in which 1 = Not a Problem and 4 = Serious Problem.
** At least one ethnic group mean differs significantly from the overall mean (p<.05).*

Black Students

In 1987 differences among ethnic groups on the measures of campus safety were not statistically significant; in 1990, however, Blacks are significantly less satisfied than other groups with personal security and safety *(F=2.92, p<.03)* and also more concerned with sexual harassment *(F=3.53, p<.01)*.

Differences between Black respondents of 1987 and 1990 are quite substantial; satisfaction with personal security and safety declined .39 of a mean rating point, while the level of concern for sexual harassment and assaults on students increased by .38 and .22 respectively.

Chicano Students

Differences among Chicano, Asian and White respondents of 1990 are small. Chicanos are slightly more satisfied with personal security and safety on campus (3.56 *versus* 3.53 for Asians and 3.49 for Whites) and, next to Asians, slightly less concerned with sexual harassment (2.04 *versus* 1.94 for Asians and 2.05 for Whites) and with assaults on students (1.88 *versus* 1.85 for Asians and 1.89 for Whites).

As is true for all ethnic groups, Chicano satisfaction with personal security and safety declined since 1987 (.21 of a mean rating point). Chicanos also show moderately increased levels of concern for sexual harassment (.15) and for assaults on students (.12).

Asian Students

Asian respondents to the 1990 survey rate campus safety similar to Chicano and White students. Since 1987, Asian satisfaction with personal security and safety fell substantially (.30 of a mean rating point). Level of concern with sexual harassment also increased considerably during this period (.27), whereas concern with assaults on students increased less (.12).

White and All Other Students

Similar to their peers, White respondents' satisfaction with security and safety on the Davis campus dropped considerably between 1987 and 1990, from 3.80 to 3.49 (.31 of a mean rating point). And their level of concern with sexual harassment and assaults on students increased as well (.23 and .22, respectively).

---

[5]Kuh, George D., et al. Institutional Case Analysis Summary, University of California, Davis. (College Experiences Study Project). Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, 1989.

SUMMARY

Several major findings from this study of the UC-Davis social environment stand out. First, Davis undergraduates are, for the most part, satisfied with the campus' social environment. They give especially high satisfaction ratings to recreational and intramural programs and to campus mass transit services. But, on the down side, they give very low satisfaction ratings to parking, racial harmony, and the degree to which students are treated as individuals.

Second, Davis undergraduates are more satisfied than their national peers with a majority of the items used to assess the social environment. In particular, they are far more satisfied than students nationally with campus mass transit services and availability of student housing, but much less satisfied with racial harmony.

Third, satisfaction with most aspects of the social environment declined between 1987 and 1990. The greatest changes occurred in the area of interpersonal relationships; there were substantial declines in satisfaction with racial harmony and concern for the student as an individual, along with large increases of concern about intolerance (associated with race, disability and sexual harassment) and assaults on students.

Fourth, as was true in 1987, satisfaction with the campus social environment varies considerably among ethnic groups. Black students report lower levels of satisfaction than undergraduates overall on most items included in the study, especially those related to issues of intolerance. Asian and White students generally express the highest levels of satisfaction with the social environment, while Chicanos fall more or less in the middle.

APPENDIX

Table A-1

FOOD SERVICES

	Very Dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very Satisfied 5	n	mean	sd
1990 NORMS	7.7%	16.5%	26.9%	41.0%	7.9%	20984	3.25	1.07
1990 UC DAVIS	5.9	15.8	29.9	38.9	9.3	861	3.30	1.04
SEX								
Male	8.5	15.4	27.5	40.3	8.3	402	3.24	1.08
Female	3.7	16.2	32.1	37.7	10.3	458	3.35	.99
ETHNICITY								
Black	11.2	18.1	31.9	32.8	6.0	35	3.04	1.11
Chicano	8.5	19.6	28.0	35.4	8.5	42	3.16	1.11
Asian	4.2	11.9	42.4	31.4	10.2	174	3.31	.96
White/Other	6.0	16.6	26.4	41.7	9.4	610	3.32	1.05
LEVEL								
Freshman	7.8	20.2	32.8	35.6	3.6	211	3.07	1.01
Sophomore	2.7	18.4	32.3	38.6	7.9	214	3.31	.95
Junior	7.1	9.4	30.5	44.0	8.9	242	3.38	1.02
Senior	6.1	16.3	23.3	36.5	17.7	194	3.44	1.14
COLLEGE								
A&ES	6.5	16.0	30.6	36.1	10.9	229	3.29	1.07
Engineering	9.5	15.3	28.3	45.2	1.7	97	3.14	1.02
L&S	5.1	15.9	29.9	39.0	10.1	535	3.33	1.02
1987 NORMS	9.1%	19.0%	26.3%	38.3%	7.3%	10301	3.16	1.10
1987 UC DAVIS	4.6	13.9	26.3	44.0	11.2	441	3.43	1.01
SEX								
Male	4.1	16.8	25.4	42.2	11.4	196	3.40	1.03
Female	5.0	11.5	26.9	45.5	11.1	245	3.46	1.00
ETHNICITY								
Black	9.8	9.8	29.5	44.3	6.6	17	3.28	1.09
Chicano	11.4	8.6	25.7	47.1	7.1	16	3.30	1.14
Asian	2.2	15.6	26.7	44.4	11.1	71	3.47	.96
White/Other	4.5	14.0	26.0	43.8	11.7	337	3.44	1.02
LEVEL								
Freshman	9.1	16.6	29.0	38.9	6.4	100	3.17	1.08
Sophomore	4.2	11.3	32.3	37.6	14.6	87	3.47	1.01
Junior	3.0	13.1	33.2	46.3	4.4	125	3.36	.88
Senior	3.0	14.3	13.3	50.0	19.4	129	3.69	1.04
COLLEGE								
A&ES	6.1	14.2	26.2	44.9	8.6	117	3.36	1.03
Engineering	6.5	12.6	37.9	35.1	7.9	51	3.25	1.00
L&S	3.6	14.0	24.1	45.3	13.0	273	3.50	1.01

Except for NORMS and ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-2

AVAILABILITY OF STUDENT HOUSING

	Very Dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very Satisfied 5	n	mean	sd
1990 NORMS	8.3%	15.7%	32.8%	36.6%	6.6%	19375	3.18	1.04
1990 UC DAVIS	1.6	9.2	22.5	45.6	21.0	848	3.75	.94
SEX								
Male	1.3	12.5	25.4	45.6	15.3	395	3.61	.93
Female	2.0	6.3	20.1	45.7	25.9	453	3.87	.94
ETHNICITY								
Black	5.3	14.2	25.2	43.1	12.2	37	3.43	1.06
Chicano	2.9	6.5	26.0	49.1	15.5	43	3.68	.92
Asian	1.8	6.4	30.3	45.0	16.5	161	3.68	.89
White/Other	1.3	9.8	20.1	45.7	23.1	607	3.79	.95
LEVEL								
Freshman	.1	5.0	19.3	45.1	30.5	213	4.01	.85
Sophomore	1.5	9.4	23.6	48.5	16.9	219	3.70	.91
Junior	1.7	14.9	21.3	41.7	20.4	231	3.64	1.02
Senior	3.5	6.7	26.5	47.7	15.6	186	3.65	.94
COLLEGE								
A&ES	2.1	7.1	26.3	44.0	20.5	217	3.74	.93
Engineering	4.7	7.5	19.6	46.9	21.2	101	3.73	1.03
L&S	.9	10.4	21.5	46.1	21.1	530	3.76	.93
1987 NORMS	5.7%	13.4%	28.2%	44.5%	8.2%	9803	3.36	1.00
1987 UC DAVIS	1.0	6.4	24.0	53.1	15.5	429	3.76	.83
SEX								
Male	1.3	7.7	27.4	50.5	13.1	201	3.66	.85
Female	.8	5.2	21.0	55.4	17.6	229	3.84	.80
ETHNICITY								
Black	1.6	4.9	29.5	45.9	18.0	17	3.74	.89
Chicano	1.5	6.2	24.6	56.9	10.8	15	3.69	.83
Asian	2.4	23.8	57.1	16.7	66	3.88	.70	
White/Other	1.1	7.3	23.8	52.5	15.3	332	3.74	.85
LEVEL								
Freshman	4.1	22.8	53.2	19.9	93	3.89	.77	
Sophomore	.6	2.8	19.3	60.7	16.6	90	3.90	.72
Junior	10.3	26.9	53.3	9.5	121	3.62	.80	
Senior	3.0	6.9	25.5	47.4	17.2	126	3.69	.94
COLLEGE								
A&ES	1.1	5.4	15.9	61.4	16.1	112	3.86	.79
Engineering	2.5	5.5	28.8	56.0	7.2	51	3.60	.81
L&S	.7	7.0	26.5	49.0	16.8	267	3.74	.84

Except for NORMS and ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-3

RACIAL HARMONY AT UC DAVIS

	Very Dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very Satisfied 5	n	mean	sd
1990 NORMS	4.1%	11.2%	34.1%	43.3%	7.3%	27980	3.38	.92
1990 UC DAVIS	7.6	20.7	33.2	32.9	5.6	927	3.08	1.03
SEX								
Male	8.0	17.9	30.1	35.0	9.0	430	3.19	1.08
Female	7.3	23.0	36.0	31.1	2.6	497	2.99	.97
ETHNICITY								
Black	29.3	34.6	24.0	11.0	1.1	40	2.20	1.03
Chicano	16.5	25.6	32.3	23.2	2.4	46	2.69	1.08
Asian	2.4	16.8	38.4	39.2	3.2	184	3.24	.85
White/Other	7.1	20.6	32.4	33.2	6.7	656	3.12	1.04
LEVEL								
Freshman	3.6	15.4	33.1	38.6	9.4	216	3.35	.97
Sophomore	8.8	16.6	41.9	29.7	3.0	234	3.01	.97
Junior	11.4	22.2	32.0	30.3	4.1	262	2.94	1.07
Senior	5.6	28.6	25.4	34.1	6.3	214	3.07	1.05
COLLEGE								
A&ES	5.8	19.7	30.5	35.8	8.2	244	3.21	1.04
Engineering	2.3	19.8	33.9	36.2	7.9	106	3.28	.95
L&S	9.3	21.2	34.3	31.1	4.0	577	2.99	1.03
1987 NORMS	4.0%	9.9%	32.4%	45.7%	7.9%	13017	3.44	.92
1987 UC DAVIS	5.0	13.5	28.0	44.6	9.0	473	3.39	1.00
SEX								
Male	6.1	10.5	30.3	44.6	8.5	222	3.39	.99
Female	4.1	16.1	25.9	44.5	9.4	251	3.39	1.00
ETHNICITY								
Black	20.3	30.4	34.8	13.0	1.4	19	2.45	1.03
Chicano	9.3	20.0	30.7	33.3	6.7	17	3.08	1.11
Asian	4.2	8.3	22.9	54.2	10.4	75	3.58	.94
White/Other	4.2	13.4	28.5	44.7	9.2	361	3.41	.97
LEVEL								
Freshman	6.6	7.2	27.1	44.1	15.0	106	3.54	1.05
Sophomore	4.1	9.0	35.7	41.1	10.2	95	3.44	.94
Junior	4.4	16.2	32.8	44.4	2.1	133	3.24	.90
Senior	5.2	18.8	18.6	47.4	10.0	139	3.38	1.06
COLLEGE								
A&ES	5.6	10.8	26.9	50.7	6.0	128	3.41	.96
Engineering	1.8	7.7	33.7	49.5	7.3	59	3.53	.82
L&S	5.5	15.9	27.2	40.8	10.6	286	3.35	1.04

Except for NORMS and ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-4

CONCERN FOR STUDENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL

	Very Dissatisfied 1	Dissatisfied 2	Neutral 3	Satisfied 4	Very Satisfied 5	n	mean	sd
1990 NORMS	7.0%	17.1%	38.0%	32.9%	5.0%	28652	3.12	.98
1990 UC DAVIS	8.2	20.9	39.7	27.3	3.9	935	2.98	.98
SEX								
Male	6.3	20.2	40.6	28.8	4.1	431	3.04	.95
Female	9.8	21.6	38.9	26.0	3.7	503	2.92	1.01
ETHNICITY								
Black	13.8	25.4	28.8	30.0	1.9	40	2.81	1.09
Chicano	8.2	20.5	34.8	32.1	4.4	45	3.04	1.03
Asian	5.6	16.9	46.0	25.8	5.6	183	3.09	.94
White/Other	8.6	21.8	38.9	27.2	3.5	667	2.95	.99
LEVEL								
Freshman	6.5	14.1	41.4	31.4	6.6	223	3.17	.98
Sophomore	5.5	20.3	47.3	24.4	2.5	236	2.98	.88
Junior	10.2	26.0	37.5	24.6	1.7	266	2.82	.98
Senior	10.4	22.5	32.1	29.6	5.4	210	2.97	1.08
COLLEGE								
A&ES	7.8	18.2	38.6	30.1	5.3	247	3.07	1.00
Engineering	2.9	21.6	45.5	25.6	4.4	103	3.07	.88
L&S	9.3	22.0	39.1	26.4	3.2	585	2.92	.99
1987 NORMS	7.8%	17.9%	36.1%	32.1%	6.1%	13276	3.11	1.02
1987 UC DAVIS	4.7	18.1	37.2	33.5	6.4	475	3.19	.96
SEX								
Male	3.8	16.4	36.5	37.8	5.6	224	3.25	.93
Female	5.5	19.7	37.9	29.7	7.2	252	3.13	.99
ETHNICITY								
Black	2.9	23.2	49.3	18.8	5.8	19	3.01	.90
Chicano	5.3	14.7	41.3	32.0	6.7	17	3.20	.98
Asian	4.1	12.2	36.7	44.9	2.0	77	3.29	.86
White/Other	4.9	19.3	36.5	31.9	7.4	363	3.18	.99
LEVEL								
Freshman	5.0	10.0	40.1	36.6	8.3	107	3.33	.95
Sophomore	3.3	21.1	33.2	32.4	10.0	94	3.25	1.01
Junior	1.9	16.9	4.8	34.2	2.1	133	3.18	.80
Senior	8.1	23.6	30.4	31.2	6.7	141	3.05	1.07
COLLEGE								
A&ES	4.4	17.9	40.0	32.9	4.7	128	3.16	.93
Engineering	2.5	10.1	37.7	47.1	2.5	61	3.37	.81
L&S	5.3	19.9	35.9	30.9	8.0	287	3.16	1.01

Except for NORMS and ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-5

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS RACIAL INTOLERANCE?

	Not A Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	n	mean	sd
1990 UC DAVIS	26.8%	35.0%	25.9%	12.2%	939	2.24	.98
SEX							
Male	31.9	34.0	24.1	10.0	440	2.12	.97
Female	22.3	36.0	27.6	14.2	499	2.34	.98
ETHNICITY							
Black	5.8	14.7	30.2	49.2	39	3.23	.92
Chicano	14.7	28.8	28.8	27.7	45	2.70	1.04
Asian	24.0	45.7	24.8	5.4	190	2.12	.83
White/Other	29.7	33.6	25.8	10.9	664	2.18	.98
LEVEL							
Freshman	38.1	30.6	22.2	9.1	223	2.02	.99
Sophomore	27.9	32.2	29.5	10.4	237	2.22	.97
Junior	24.7	35.2	29.6	10.4	262	2.26	.95
Senior	16.6	42.4	21.3	19.7	216	2.44	.99
COLLEGE							
A&ES	31.7	36.4	20.5	11.4	248	2.11	.98
Engineering	15.5	39.6	27.1	17.8	106	2.47	.96
L&S	26.8	33.6	28.0	11.6	585	2.24	.98
1987 UC DAVIS	44.8%	29.6%	17.7%	7.9%	476	1.89	.96
SEX							
Male	48.4	26.2	18.1	7.3	221	1.84	.97
Female	41.8	32.5	17.4	8.4	255	1.92	.96
ETHNICITY							
Black	10.4	23.9	37.3	28.4	18	2.84	.98
Chicano	29.6	32.4	26.8	11.3	16	2.20	1.02
Asian	54.2	25.0	12.5	8.3	75	1.75	.97
White/Other	45.3	30.7	17.4	6.6	365	1.85	.93
LEVEL							
Freshman	52.0	28.7	13.8	5.5	105	1.73	.90
Sophomore	43.6	32.5	17.5	6.4	95	1.87	.93
Junior	43.7	31.7	15.1	9.5	134	1.90	.98
Senior	41.4	26.2	23.2	9.2	142	2.00	1.01
COLLEGE							
A&ES	50.7	24.8	17.7	6.9	127	1.81	.96
Engineering	43.9	34.4	16.0	5.6	61	1.83	.90
L&S	42.4	30.7	18.1	8.8	287	1.93	.98

Except for ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-6

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE OF HOMOSEXUALITY?

	Not A Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	n	mean	sd
1990 UC DAVIS	30.1%	35.3%	24.7%	9.9%	937	2.14	.96
SEX							
Male	33.9	33.2	22.8	10.2	439	2.09	.98
Female	26.7	37.2	26.4	9.7	497	2.19	.94
ETHNICITY							
Black	19.4	29.4	22.6	28.6	38	2.60	1.11
Chicano	22.2	35.5	27.0	15.4	45	2.35	1.00
Asian	32.8	39.8	18.0	9.4	189	2.04	.94
White/Other	30.5	34.4	26.6	8.6	664	2.13	.95
LEVEL							
Freshman	30.1	38.0	21.2	10.7	223	2.12	.96
Sophomore	28.3	38.5	25.5	7.6	237	2.12	.91
Junior	31.4	35.1	24.4	9.1	262	2.11	.96
Senior	30.4	29.2	27.8	12.5	214	2.22	1.02
COLLEGE							
A&ES	32.7	31.1	30.1	6.1	248	2.10	.93
Engineering	21.3	42.6	29.5	6.6	105	2.21	.86
L&S	30.6	35.8	21.5	12.1	584	2.15	.99
1987 UC DAVIS	38.8%	28.8%	23.6%	8.8%	477	2.02	.99
SEX							
Male	45.3	27.9	17.9	8.9	221	1.90	.99
Female	33.2	29.5	28.6	8.7	256	2.13	.98
ETHNICITY							
Black	17.9	32.8	29.9	19.4	18	2.51	1.03
Chicano	29.6	42.3	22.5	5.6	16	2.04	.89
Asian	43.7	22.9	20.8	12.5	75	2.02	1.08
White/Other	39.2	29.2	24.0	7.6	367	2.00	.97
LEVEL							
Freshman	39.8	33.2	19.0	8.0	106	1.95	.96
Sophomore	43.0	35.4	17.8	3.8	95	1.82	.86
Junior	40.9	24.7	25.2	9.2	134	2.03	1.02
Senior	33.3	24.9	29.5	12.3	142	2.21	1.04
COLLEGE							
A&ES	40.0	29.4	23.3	7.3	127	1.98	.97
Engineering	53.0	26.1	12.8	8.1	61	1.76	.97
L&S	35.3	29.1	26.1	9.6	289	2.10	1.00

Except for ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-7

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS INTOLERANCE OF FOREIGN ORIGIN?

	Not A Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	n	mean	sd
1990 UC DAVIS	41.0%	34.4%	18.1%	6.5%	938	1.90	.92
SEX							
Male	41.3	33.3	19.1	6.3	439	1.90	.92
Female	40.8	35.3	17.2	6.7	499	1.90	.92
ETHNICITY							
Black	30.4	29.6	24.5	15.4	38	2.25	1.06
Chicano	28.0	38.2	19.1	14.7	45	2.20	1.02
Asian	32.6	42.6	22.5	2.3	190	1.95	.80
White/Other	44.9	32.0	16.4	6.6	664	1.85	.93
LEVEL							
Freshman	49.4	32.0	16.9	1.7	222	1.71	.80
Sophomore	45.7	28.6	21.8	4.0	237	1.84	.90
Junior	41.1	35.7	15.9	7.3	262	1.89	.92
Senior	27.0	41.6	18.0	13.4	216	2.18	.98
COLLEGE							
A&ES	50.5	33.5	13.4	2.7	248	1.68	.80
Engineering	35.3	29.4	25.2	10.1	106	2.10	1.00
L&S	38.0	35.7	18.8	7.5	585	1.96	.93
1987 UC DAVIS	43.8%	32.8%	17.0%	6.3%	477	1.86	.92
SEX							
Male	45.1	30.6	17.6	6.7	221	1.86	.94
Female	42.7	34.8	16.5	6.0	256	1.86	.90
ETHNICITY							
Black	23.9	37.3	26.9	11.9	18	2.27	.98
Chicano	33.8	36.6	19.7	9.9	16	2.06	.99
Asian	47.9	25.0	20.8	6.2	75	1.85	.96
White/Other	44.4	34.0	15.6	5.9	367	1.83	.90
LEVEL							
Freshman	59.8	24.6	11.3	4.3	106	1.60	.86
Sophomore	47.5	35.9	12.4	4.1	95	1.73	.84
Junior	36.2	42.4	16.3	5.1	134	1.90	.85
Senior	36.8	27.8	25.0	10.4	142	2.09	1.02
COLLEGE							
A&ES	45.6	27.9	22.7	3.9	127	1.85	.91
Engineering	38.8	34.5	21.2	5.5	61	1.93	.91
L&S	44.1	34.6	13.6	7.6	289	1.85	.93

Except for ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.

Table A-8

HOW MUCH OF A PROBLEM FOR UC DAVIS STUDENTS IS ALCOHOL ABUSE?

	Not A Problem 1	Minor Problem 2	Moderate Problem 3	Serious Problem 4	n	mean	sd
1990 UC DAVIS	14.1%	27.7%	39.8%	18.4%	939	2.62	.94
SEX							
Male	16.5	31.8	34.9	16.8	440	2.52	.96
Female	12.0	24.1	44.2	19.8	499	2.72	.92
ETHNICITY							
Black	9.0	19.1	33.6	38.3	39	3.01	.98
Chicano	13.3	25.5	39.1	22.1	45	2.70	.97
Asian	15.5	32.6	35.7	16.3	190	2.53	.94
White/Other	14.1	27.0	41.4	17.6	664	2.63	.93
LEVEL							
Freshman	14.8	29.5	40.7	15.0	223	2.56	.92
Sophomore	14.7	31.1	38.0	16.3	237	2.56	.93
Junior	13.2	29.2	42.4	15.3	262	2.60	.90
Senior	13.9	20.4	37.8	28.0	216	2.80	1.00
COLLEGE							
A&ES	10.9	35.4	38.4	15.2	248	2.58	.88
Engineering	14.9	30.6	33.7	20.8	105	2.60	.98
L&S	15.3	23.9	41.5	19.3	585	2.65	.96
1987 UC DAVIS	14.4%	25.9%	38.2%	21.5%	478	2.67	.97
SEX							
Male	18.0	32.7	30.6	18.7	222	2.50	.99
Female	11.2	20.0	44.8	23.9	256	2.82	.93
ETHNICITY							
Black	6.0	25.4	32.8	35.8	18	2.99	.95
Chicano	15.5	25.4	32.4	26.8	16	2.70	1.06
Asian	18.8	39.6	22.9	18.8	75	2.42	1.00
White/Other	13.8	23.2	41.9	21.1	368	2.70	.95
LEVEL							
Freshman	13.4	19.2	38.7	28.7	106	2.83	1.00
Sophomore	17.4	24.5	36.0	22.1	96	2.63	1.02
Junior	12.9	29.2	42.1	15.8	134	2.61	.90
Senior	14.5	28.8	35.6	21.1	142	2.63	.97
COLLEGE							
A&ES	16.4	28.7	36.2	18.7	127	2.57	.98
Engineering	12.7	42.2	28.4	16.8	61	2.49	.92
L&S	13.8	21.3	41.2	23.7	290	2.75	.97

Except for ETHNICITY, these tables use weighted values.